SUPREME COURT MINUTES THURSDAY, MAY 10, 2012 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S029843

PEOPLE v. BECK (JAMES DAVID) & CRUZ (GERALD DEAN)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Andrew Parnes's representation that he anticipates filing appellant James David Beck's reply brief by June 1, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 1, 2012. After that date, no further extension will be granted.

S052210

PEOPLE v. RODRIGUEZ III (JERRY)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Mark A. Johnson's representation that he anticipates filing the respondent's brief by June 15, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 15, 2012. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S111336

BENAVIDES FIGUEROA (VICENTE) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Cristina Bordé's representation that she anticipates filing the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus by November 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that document is granted to July 6, 2012. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 additional days are contemplated.

S113653

PEOPLE v. HOYT (RYAN JAMES)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General David F. Glassman's representation that he anticipates filing the respondent's brief by July 7, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to July 9, 2012. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S135855

PEOPLE v. AVILA (ALEJANDRO)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Jonathan P. Milberg's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by July 9, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to July 9, 2012. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S136800

PEOPLE v. MORALES (ALFONSO IGNACIO)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Diane Berley's representation that she anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by November 1, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to July 3, 2012. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 additional days will be granted.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S139103

PEOPLE v. JACKSON (BAILEY LAMAR)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Richard I. Targow's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by July 3, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to July 3, 2012. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S194628

VANTILBURG (CLIFFORD JOHN) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is extended to June 6, 2012.

S201538 A131656 First Appellate District, Div. 1

GLOBAL HAWK INSURANCE COMPANY v. CENTURY-NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to answer to petition for review is extended to May 21, 2012.

S185303 B224400 Second Appellate District, Div. 5 COLEY (WILLIE CLIFFORD) ON H.C.

Order filed

In addition to other points that the parties may choose to address at oral argument, the court directs the parties to be prepared to address the question whether a trial court's factual finding at a sentencing hearing regarding the circumstances relating to a petitioner's triggering offense may affect the determination whether a sentence constitutes cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment of the federal Constitution.